

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/623,382	CARSON, JAMES CRAWFORD	
	<b>Examiner</b> Dean O. Takaoka	<b>Art Unit</b> 2817	
<b>All Participants:</b>		<b>Status of Application:</b> _____	
(1) <u>Dean O. Takaoka</u> .		(3) _____.	
(2) <u>Michael J. Mehrman</u> .		(4) _____.	
<b>Date of Interview:</b> <u>26 April 2005</u>		<b>Time:</b> <u>1:00p</u>	
<b>Type of Interview:</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)			
<b>Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
If Yes, provide a brief description: .			
<b>Part I.</b>			
<b>Rejection(s) discussed:</b>			
35 U.S.C. 102, 103			
<b>Claims discussed:</b>			
1-37			
<b>Prior art documents discussed:</b>			
<i>Nishikawa et al., Rosen, Koch</i>			
<b>Part II.</b>			
<b>SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:</b>			
See Continuation Sheet			
<b>Part III.</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.			

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: With respect to Applicant's amendment received March 28, 2005, it was the position of the Examiner that the amendments to the independent claims did not patentably distinguish over the prior art. Regarding the differences between the independent claims and the rejection of record, Nishikawa et al. could be combined with the prior art of record to form striplines, Butler matrices, et al. however it was agreed Nishikawa et al. did not show the embodiment such as shown in Applicant's figure 3B. It was agreed to further amend the claims by supplemental amendment to further distinguish Applicant's invention over the prior art. .